



## Regional Workshop #1 Summary

**Project:** South Davis County Transit DEIS  
**Date/Time:** Thursday, March 8, 2007; 11:00 A.M. – 1:00 P.M.  
**Subject:** Goals and Objectives, Problem Statements  
**Location:** Bountiful City Hall

### Attendees

Utah Transit Authority	Kerry Doane
Utah Department of Transportation	Angelo Papastamos Rex Harris
Carter & Burgess	Keith Hall Michael Adams Andrew Gemperline Colleen Lavery Bill Lieberman
H. W. Lochner	Kim Clark Saffron Capson Jacqueline Jensen Ross Peterson
Fehr & Peers	Jon Nepstad Robin Hutcheson
WFRC	Greg Scott
UBET	Roger Borgenicht
Bountiful	Dorothy Barlow Grant Horsley Clark Jenkins Aric Jensen Tom Smith
Centerville	Bill Davies Tami Fillmore George Fisher Sherri Lindstrom Cory Snyder Steve Thacker
Farmington	Scott Harbertson (Mayor) Chadwick Greenhalgh Scott Ogilvie David Petersen Sid Young
North Salt Lake	Shanna Schaefermeyer (Mayor) Blaine Gehring

	Conrad Jacobson
Salt Lake City	Kevin Young
West Bountiful	Michael Eggett Jim Hanks Dave Tovey Wendell Wild Roger Wray
Woods Cross	Vic Arnold Anne Blankenship Tim Stephens

## Notes

The notes contained within this document provide a summary of the content discussed during the meeting on the given date and time stated above. If this content differs from your understanding, please notify Jacqueline Jensen of any discrepancies within five working days.

## Summary of the Regional Workshop

### (1) Welcome and Introductions

- Upon entering the Regional Workshop, each participant was given a nametag; a packet with the agenda, compiled list of problem statements from the various sub-committee meetings, and a sheet of goals and objectives; and five colored dots.
- Angelo Papastamos began the meeting by introducing himself from UDOT and Kerry Doane from UTA. Explained that this is to understand the regional issues. Kerry invited attendees to a UTA bus route redesign open house later in the day and explained that it was an effort by a different UTA department and separate from our study.

### (2) Overview of Regional Meetings

- Kim Clark explained the general focus of this workshop and went through the agenda. The main focus is going to center on creating problem statements for approximately one hour. Each participant will have the opportunity to work on two topics. Second, the focus will be on ranking the importance of the goals and objectives. Representatives from the same city should be dispersed among the various tables.
- All participants were invited to have lunch which was provided.

### (3) Overview of Regional Meetings

- Kim Clark introduced all of the project management team members who were in attendance. Each participant from the various cities then introduced themselves to the group.
- Kim explained the Code of Conduct, the Regional Workshop Objectives, and the Responsibilities.
- She also explained the purpose of having a different topic at each table, but that there may still be some overlap of problems between topics.

- There will be two rotations to the Problem Statement portion of this workshop. After spending time creating Problem Statements at a first table, participants will then move to a second table of their choice to again create problem statements during the second rotation of this exercise.
- Kim then explained the difference between a problem statement and a solution, and emphasized again that the purpose here is to create problem statements.

#### (4) Problem Statements Exercise

- The sub-committee members divided themselves among the eight tables and created generalized, condensed problem statements using the broader list of problem statements that had been compiled from the individual sub-committee meetings.
- Groups began their conversations at approximately 11:35 A.M.
- Each statement was written on a piece paper and placed under its respective table's topic on a board in the front of the room.
- At 12:00 P.M. the participants were directed to finish their conversations at their first table and invited to find a second table they would like to participate in. They were allowed to stay at the same table if they felt strongly to do so.
- Similar discussion ensued and more problem statements were created.
- The second rotation concluded at approximately 12:25 P.M.
- The following table shows the total number of participants and consultant facilitators (approximately 1 or 2) at each table during both discussion rotations:

Table Topic	First Rotation	Second Rotation
Bus Routes	3	4
Access to Transit	5	7
East-West Access	4	5
General Transportation / Traffic	7	3
Pedestrians, Bikes, and Trails	5	4
North-South Access	5	5
Schools / Bus Stops	5	4
Growth / Development and Future Needs	6	6

- Jacqueline Jensen typed the list of problem statements as they were added to the board. The statements are in the following list:

#### Bus Routes

- There are no east-west bus routes
- Transit trips the require a transfer often take longer than driving a car
- There is only limited bus service to the north during the day and after 6:00 p.m.
- There is no north-south service west of Main Street
- Bus are often full during peak hours
- Future access to commuter rail station is not planned to be well served by buses
- Bus service is infrequent and unreliable
- South Davis residents don't use transit because they don't like it, don't create unified demand, and don't understand the benefits *\*\* (This statement was later challenged by others in attendance who said that residents do recognize transit's benefits in reducing congestion.)\*\**
- No north-south bus routes on west side of I-15

- Buses from South Davis are not well coordinated with Salt Lake County buses and trains
- No cross-town buses to connect to existing north-south transit
- UTA is less committed to South Davis County transit than Salt Lake County

#### Access to Transit

- Need greater awareness of the use of LDS parking as park and ride
- Difficult access to West Bountiful and Woods Cross commuter rail station may limit the effectiveness of transit, given the short distance to Salt Lake City
- For non-Salt Lake commutes (i.e. northbound), the lack of transit to reach final destination may limit effectiveness of transit
- Transit is commuter-oriented and the system does not address need for short trips – circulation within South Davis is not convenient
- Existing transit system requires out of direction travel, if trip is even possible
- Are existing bus routes frequent enough? Do bus routes link origins and destinations? (No)
- Lack of bike lanes and sidewalks in some areas limits safe access to transit
- Transit riders have inadequate access to commuter rail station and to other transit riders (I-15 barriers, lack of pedestrian access, lack of bus connections)
- Centerville and Bountiful has main streets that are not wide enough to accommodate transit without forcing auto traffic onto other streets
- Commuter rail addresses long distance commuter, but South Davis is a short commute
- Lack of transit circulator and routes into Salt Lake City and to commuter rail stations
- Lack of (known plans for) bike access and parking for commuter rail stations (“lack of recognition of alternative modes that provide safe access to transit”)
- Lack of east-west bus routes limits local travel and access to commuter rail
- Transit is not being provided in newly developing (high growth) areas, such as Redwood Road
- Transit is not frequent enough nor does it provide adequate coverage
- Main Street in Centerville and Bountiful is not wide enough to accommodate transit without forcing auto traffic onto other streets

#### East-West Access

- Frequency of train blocking east-west access and contributing and access issue (Pages Street especially)
- 500 South congestion receives all issues (access, Legacy interchange congestion, future commuter rail influx, commuter rail station location on west side- must cross tracks from east side, I-15, 500 west)
- Commuter Rail station increases congestion on 500 south. I-15 and Legacy will create congestion to go east to Bountiful. 1100 west from 400 north will receive congestion and changes.
- Park and ride areas are only located on arterial routes where congestion is
- Frequency of train blocking east-west access and contributing to the congestion and access issue (Pages Lane)
- East-west transit needed to get to north-south (mostly Salt Lake City) or it's easier to just drive
- East-west access is an issue, but mass transit education (frequency, headway, etc.) is needed to increase future east-west ridership to go north-south
- North-south throughs become barriers to east-west movement
- Non-collector routes are receiving congestion spill over from current collector routes

#### General Transportation / Traffic

- Neighborhood streets becoming collector streets
- I-15 access is difficult and ramp meters are effective
- Poor traffic operations on I-15 interchange cross-streets
- Minimal transit accessibility to transit
- Concern about property and access with a potential fixed guideway transit in Centerville and Farmington
- I-15 becomes a carrier to east-west travel
- No transportation planning west of I-15 to keep up with development
- No transit service on west side of I-15
- Commuter rail stations are right on I-15
- Need to improve technology related to transit and traffic
- Need more transportation options thru Centerville and Farmington – “pinch point”
- Current alternate transit choices are inadequate
- Ensure transit South Davis integrated with Salt Lake transit system
- Legacy traffic cannot access east part of Salt Lake City
- Inadequate current information about transit options

#### Pedestrians, Bikes, and Trails

- Problems created by snow are not considered in pedestrian and bike facility design and maintenance
- Too many areas still do not have sidewalks
- New bus routes will create longer walks for current riders
- Western expansion and housing not being designed with good pedestrian and bike access
- Traffic signals not actuated by bicycles
- Bikeways and trails are not integrated or well marked
- Commuter rail won't accommodate bikes on commuter rail cars or in stations
- Not creating parallel surfaces for horses, pedestrians, or bikes on new trails
- Is enough being done to link transit with bikes, trails, bike lanes, etc. to ensure safe and effective coordination between modes?
- No safe bike or pedestrian access across I-15
- Lack of dedicated bike lanes to access bus stops, commuter rail, and trails
- Limited bike accommodation on buses

#### North-South Access

- South Davis County experiences poor north-south movements at peak travel times due to geographic constraints future capacity improvements are limited
- South Davis transit riders need good access to other regional transit facilities
- For many reasons, the population in the growing North Davis and Weber County are continue to find it necessary to commute south. Due to geographical constraints it is impossible for South Davis County to forever meet this trend. Therefore, more must be done to attract people North or provide transit, commuter rail, light rail, etc.
- Inadequate capacity (all modes) and problems are exhibited at the peak hour
- Congestion on I-15 cannot be relieved due to lack of redundant routes, especially west of I-15

#### Schools / Bus Stops

- There is a need for adequate, functional, and desirable bus stops that focus on comfort, safety, landscaping, accessibility, and security which needs to be sustainable over time
- There is a lack of effective and efficient access to school, education, and recreation facilities, both locally and regionally
- Problems with safe crossings of roads, rails, and routes to access transit and school facilities
- People are unaware of the bus stops
- Lack of formal bus stops including concrete pad, ADA accessible, shelter, and usually appealing
- Lack of feeder bus stops bringing people into the main transit corridor
- Current bus stops/routes do not get students where they need to go
- I-15, commuter rail, and 500 west are major pedestrian barriers (safety, distance, and accessibility)

#### Growth / Development and Future Needs

- Growth in Syracuse and Nest Point (and other communities north of study area) creates resident travel to the “economic engine” in Salt Lake County
- No fixed transit asset to concentrate urban development
- “Macro” (regional) solutions may cause “micro” problems in individual (city) communities
- Commuter rail is not a time savings south of Farmington
- Centerville is a bottleneck for traffic – geographic limitation in Centerville
- Enormous west side (west of Redwood) growth is a problem for transportation and transit. Freeway access is a problem (bad west side access), outmoded interchanges (one way off-ramps and not full-service to west, and tracks to contend with.
- Fear of density, change, and fading rural community
- Value perception does not currently exist for transit benefit
- Residents do not want to be bullied into compliance (i.e. Centerville conditions are different than Bountiful) – relates to micro/macro situations
- Population increases outside the region has impact on South Davis region and micro changes in population within South Davis also effect other South Davis communities
- Mass transit is not effective for family transportation (i.e. cost, time, control of kids) *\*\* (This statement was challenged later by others in attendance who said that families can and do use mass transit.)\*\**
- Focal points with South Davis County are changing (i.e. Cultural Center and Recreation Center)
- Not enough east-west access for developing areas west of I-15 to efficiently use north-south transit
- Capacity of roadways is not keeping up with growth
- VMT (vehicle miles traveled) is increasing and there are more cars per household
- North Salt Lake (Eaglewood) area has fast growth that is overwhelming the residential streets and interchanges (Orchard Lane)

#### (5) Goals and Objectives Exercise

- Kim Clark explained that the purpose of the “dot game” is to understand which statements are most important to the sub-committee members. Participants should place the colored dots they were given on those statements that they feel are most important.
- More than one dot per person may be placed on any one goal and objective statement.
- Place the dots on the posters on the wall — not on the sheet of paper that came in the packet distributed to each individual.
- The “dot game” was explained and completed during the time from approximately 12:25 P.M. to 12:40 P.M.
- The results of the goals and objectives dot game are shown in the following table:

<b>Goals and Objectives Statements</b>	<b>Total Number of Dots</b>	<b>Rank</b>
1. Create a complete transit system within the region that connects to transit options serving outside of the region.	25	1
2. Develop and improve infrastructure to serve transit system (park and ride, bus stops, stations).	7	8
3. Provide attractive transit amenities to improve transit use.	10	5
4. Increase transit ridership especially during commute times.	9	6
5. Integrate South Davis system with SLC current and proposed transit systems.	8	7
6. Improve east-west connectivity.	21	2
7. Improve access alternatives to economic centers.	4	10
8. Integrate transit investments and land use plans.	15	4
9. Use potentially dividing corridors to an advantage – minimize barriers.	1	12
10. Maintain and enhance safety.	4	10
11. Enhance quality of life through transportation options.	5	9
12. Improve non-motorized access.	7	8
13. Eliminate backtracking by improving access to north-south transportation corridors.	2	11
14. Improve access to public locations.	4	10
15. Reduce auto congestion.	18	3



**(6) Summary and Next Meeting**

- The next meeting will be held from 11:00 A.M. to 1:00 P.M. on May 16, 2007.
- During the remainder of the time until the end of the workshop at approximately 1:00 P.M., the problem statements were read and reviewed as a group.
- There were a few disagreements with some of the problem statements.
  - (i) Families *can and do use* mass transit.
  - (ii) People *do understand* transit and the benefit it can have in reducing congestion.
  - (iii) There is inadequate capacity during the peak hour for *all modes of travel*.
- There were statements voicing other considerations.
  - (i) Consider frontage roads, time or schedule the transfers to reduce waiting for transfers, and provide service to all divisions of transit (local, community, and regional).
  - (ii) Dedicated right-of-ways create better long-term investment possibilities for residents and land-use developments because those transit systems are fixed. Bus routes are subject to change too easily and infrastructure improvements may become obsolete if a change occurs.

---

**Next Meeting**

Date/Time: Thursday, May 16, 2007; 11:00 P.M.  
Location: Bountiful City Hall

---

*Subsequent to the Regional Workshop, the following problem statements were added following the Salt Lake City sub-committee meeting on March 21<sup>st</sup>:*

**Transit service is not frequent enough.**

- *There is a need for more frequent and after hours transit service from South Davis County to commercial centers, educational facilities, and the hospitality industry in Salt Lake City (SLC Sub-Committee)*
- *Buses are exceeding capacity at peak hours (SLC Sub-Committee)*

**Transit connections are time consuming.**

- *The free fare zone in Salt Lake City is not frequent enough. More needs to be done to encourage transit within downtown once South Davis residents reach Salt Lake City. (SLC Sub-committee)*
- *A simple and easily understood transit system is needed to attract more ridership. (SLC Sub-committee)*





**Transit service is not well integrated to SL and Weber County service, or does not serve destinations in these areas adequately.**

- *A cost efficient transit system is needed that is well integrated with Salt Lake City's transit system. (SLC Sub-Committee)*

**Auxiliary facilities to transit, including bicycle routes and facilities (i.e. bikes on buses), good sidewalks, bus shelters, and park and ride lots are inadequate, and hinder bus use.**

- *Centralized parking in Salt Lake City is needed to avoid the need to drive in downtown. (SLC Sub-committee)*
- *Pedestrian environment facilities and roads around Intermodal Center need to be upgraded. (SLC Sub-Committee)*